

REMARKS

Claim 1 is amended to include the features of claim 10, which is cancelled without prejudice. Independent claims 19 and 20 are amended to include similar features. Claim 8 is cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1-7, 9, and 11-20 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Non-obviousness over Lulla-Lipe and Lulla-Lipe-Tang combinations

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 9, 15, 17 and 19-20 are understood to be patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over “Lulla” (U.S. Patent No. 6,922,820 to Lulla et al.) in view of “Lipe” (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,980 to Lipe). The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action does not show that all the features are suggested by the combination and does not provide a proper motivation for modifying the teachings of Lulla with teachings of Lipe. The rejection is moot, however, in view of the amendments to independent claims 1, 19, and 20 to include the features of claim 10.

Claim 1, as amended to include the features of claim 10, which is now cancelled, is understood to be patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over the Lulla-Lipe combination in further view of “Tang” (U.S. Patent No. 5,635,855 to Tang). The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action does not show that all the features are suggested by the combination and does not provide a proper motivation for modifying the teachings of the Lulla-Lipe combination with teachings of Tang.

According to claim 1, a method is provided for identifying a system. The method includes reading values of identification codes from each of a plurality of devices of the system and generating a system identifier value that identifies the system as a function of the read values. The plurality of devices are coupled in a scan chain, and the function used in generating the system identifier value is further a function of respective positions of the plurality of devices in a scan chain. The Lulla-Lipe-Tang combination clearly does not read identification codes from a plurality of devices that are coupled in a scan chain and use those read identification codes to generate a system identifier value as a function of values of the codes and of the

positions in the scan chain.

Lulla provides a circuit for selecting one of a number of identification codes from a single device (col. 1, line 65 – col. 2, line 2). Lipe teaches a system for configuring devices of a computer (Abstract) and part of the configuring of a device includes identifying the device. The device identification code includes an identification code and an appended bus identification code, where the bus identification code uniquely identifies the system bus associated with the connected device (col. 7, line 61 – col. 8, line 8). Thus, both Lulla and Lipe identify a single device, and Lipe happens to use a bus identification code to identify a single device.

Tang teaches techniques for programming multiple programmable devices simultaneously (col. 1, lines 5-10). Tang creates an “ispSTREAM” file that holds the bit stream necessary to shift data and instructions in a serially connected chain of PLDs (col. 7, lines 10-18). The creating of the ispSTREAM file does not in any apparent manner appear to be generated using the values of identification codes read from a plurality of devices. Nor is there any apparent suggestion by Tang to use values of identification codes read from a plurality of devices to generate the ispSTREAM file. Therefore, the Office Action has not shown that the Lulla-Lipe-Tang combination suggests the features of claim 1 as amended.

The asserted motivation for modifying Lulla with teachings of Tang is unsupported by evidence and improper. The Office Action states that “it would have been obvious ... to improve upon the method of Lulla by implementing ... the function used in generating the system identifier value is further a function of respective positions of the plurality of devices in a scan chain because it would provide the modified Lulla’s method with the enhanced capability of programming the PLDs [Tang, col. 7, lines 11-18].” This asserted motivation simply states Tang’s function. Lulla’s teachings are for selecting an ID code from a PLD, whereas Tang’s function is to generate a file that contains configuration bitstreams for multiple PLDs. Thus, the teachings are unrelated and there is no evidence presented that suggests how Lulla’s circuit that selects one of a number of ID codes on a PLD would even utilize programming multiple PLDs. Therefore, the asserted motivation is improper.

Amended independent claims 19 and 20 include features similar to those of claim 1 as discussed above. Claims 2, 4-5, 9, 15, 17, and 18 depend from claim 1 (claims 8 and 10 are cancelled). Therefore, the Office Action has not shown that the Lulla-Lipe-Tang combination suggests all the features of these claims for at least the reasons set forth above.

The rejection of claims 1-2, 4-5, 9, 15, 17, and 18 should be withdrawn because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Nonobviousness over the Lulla-Lipe-Dreyer combination

Claim 3 is understood to be patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over the Lulla-Lipe combination in further view of “Dreyer” (U.S. Patent No. 5,794,066 to Dreyer et al.) The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action does not show that all the features are suggested by the combination and does not provide a proper motivation for modifying the teachings of the Lulla-Lipe combination with teachings of Dreyer. The rejection is moot, however, in view of the amendment to claim 1 and should be withdrawn.

Non-obviousness over the Lulla-Lipe-Jacobson combination

Claims 6-7 and 16 are understood to be patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over the Lulla-Lipe combination in further view of “Jacobson” (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,867 to Jacobson et al.) The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action does not show that all the features are suggested by the combination and does not provide a proper motivation for modifying the teachings of the Lulla-Lipe combination with teachings of Jacobson. The rejection is moot, however, in view of the amendment to claim 1 and should be withdrawn.

Non-obviousness over the Lulla-Lipe-Jacobson-IBM combination

Claims 11-14 are understood to be patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over the Lulla-Lipe-Jacobson combination in further view of “IBMTM Technical Disclosure Bulletin” (IBM), NA8909262. The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action does not show that all the features are suggested by the combination and does

not provide a proper motivation for modifying the teachings of the Lulla-Lipe-Jacobson combination with teachings of IBM. The rejection is moot, however, in view of the amendment to claim 1 and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and a notice of allowance are respectfully requested in view of the Remarks presented above. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, a telephone call to the undersigned is invited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Justin Liu 51,959/

Justin Liu
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 51,959
(408) 879-4641

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed via EFS-Web with the United States Patent & Trademark Office on February 8, 2008.

/Katherine Stofer/
Typed Name: Katherine Stofer